

REMARKS

Claims 1-12 are pending in the application.

Claims 1- 4 and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 as being unpatentable over Cioli et al. (U.S. Patent 6,510,151) (Cioli) in view of Gossert Dalron et al.

Cioli describes filtering packets received by a switch in which a set of known connection-oriented virtual connections for the switch are stored, a packet corresponding to one of the known virtual connections is forwarded from one port to another port, and one of the packets selectively in line is filtered and received by the switch on the first port, when the packet does not correspond to one of the known virtual connections.

In the Office Action Cioli CPU 23 is equated to the main processor of independent claim 1, referenced portion in col.7, lines 55-67 with the first portion of same, and referenced portion in col.7, lines 34-42 with the second portion of same.

Considering the contents of the Final Office Action, it is believed that the Examiner is asserting that the "main processor" and the "second portion" of the present independent claim 1 correspond to Cioli's "CPU" and "known connection table", respectively.

However, it is not clear, from the portion referenced to by the Examiner, which elements of Cioli's disclosure correspond to the "first portion" of claim 1.

Currently, it is assumed that the Examiner equates the "first portion" with Cioli's "BAF (bridge address filter)". It is clear from Cioli's Fig. 3 and the portion referenced to by the Examiner that the "BAF table" is provided not on the subsequent stage of the main processor (CPU) but on the preceding stage thereof. Also, there is no relationship between the "BAF table" and "known connection table" disclosed by Cioli.

Therefore, provided the Examiner clarifies that Cioli's "BAF table" corresponds to the "first portion", the above argument should be persuasive.

Further Applicants understand that Cioli's invention is for reducing the processing load of the CPU, with respect to packets to be filtered without being forwarded, by filtering the packets at the existing BAF hardware.

Therefore, Cioli bypasses the filtering process of the CPU. However, the CPU continues to execute the forwarding process.

On the other hand, the present invention bypasses the main processor that executes the routing process, filtering process, and priority control process. Meanwhile, not only the packets to be filtered but also the packets to be forwarded are processed as objects of the bypass and eventually forwarded. This is different from Cioli's disclosure where the BAF merely performs the filtering process.

To achieve the above-mentioned effect of the present invention, the processing result of the main processor including the transmitting interface (which corresponds to Cioli's forwarding port) and the MAC address to be written in the transmitted packet, which cannot be read from the received packet, must be obtained.

Accordingly, the first portion is arranged at the subsequent stage of the main processor.

The determination of the transmitting interface and the MAC address is described on page 7, lines 9-14 of applicant's specification for example.

On the other hand, elements 34 and 38 shown in Cioli's Fig. 3 execute the forwarding process. Although the element 34 obtains the forwarding port, such information on the forwarding port is not transmitted elsewhere. This is a matter of course since Cioli bypasses only

the filtering process. Therefore, it is understood that no information line connected from the first portion to the second portion exists in Cioli's disclosure.

In the Office Action Gossett Dalton is asserted as showing the obviousness that the routing process includes the priority control process. However, the question is, whether or not the priority, which is obtained as the result of the priority control process and cannot be read from the packet, can be used for forwarding at the time of bypass. It should be noted that this is not possible with the arrangement of Cioli.

The term "bypass" is used as conveying the meaning of diverting the main processor and using processing blocks (see Fig. 2) that are used even when the "bypass" is not performed so that eventually the packets are outputted. Although it may depend on the general interpretation of the term "bypass", the inventors believe that mere omission of processing by the CPU as in Cioli's disclosure is not called a "bypass".

As described above, Cioli fails to disclose "bypass" as claimed in claimed 1 and thus cannot achieve the effect of the bypass of claim 1.

It is to be noted that Cioli clarifies on Col. 7, lines 60-67 that the BAF is used only for filtering and not for forwarding packets and that BAF can only store the destination address. This may constitute grounds for arguing that the BAF, whether corresponding to the first portion or second portion, cannot identify a connection.

Further Gossett Dalton et al. fails to teach the lacking features of Cioli. The features of applicant's Claim 1 will not be achieved nor are suggested by combining the teaching of Cioli with that of Gossett Dalton et al. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted claim 1 is patentable over Cioli in view of Gossett Dalton et al. under 35 U.S.C. §103(a).

Claims 2-4, and 12 are likewise patentable over Cioli in view of Gossett Dalton et al. under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) at least because of their direct or indirect dependency from claim 1 and because they each recite additional distinguishing features.

Claims 5-11 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Cioli et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,510,151) in view of Boucher et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,247,060).

In view of the remarks set forth above, this application is in condition for allowance which action is respectfully requested. However, if for any reason the Examiner should consider this application not to be in condition for allowance, the Examiner is respectfully requested to telephone the undersigned attorney at the number listed below prior to issuing a further Action.

Any fee due with this paper may be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-1290.

Respectfully submitted,



Brian S. Myers
Reg. No. 46,947

CUSTOMER NUMBER 026304
Telephone: (212) 940-8703
Fax: (212) 940-8986/8987
Docket No.: FUJZ 17.261 (100794-11402)